



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,088	07/12/2001	Peter K. Malkin	YOR9-2001-0331 1876 (8728-517) EXAMINER	
46069 7	1590 11/17/2004			
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD			BORISSOV, IGOR N	
WOODBURY.			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3629	
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/904,088	MALKIN ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
· ·	Igor Borissov	3629	[(<i>(()</i>
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing da			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the second of the control	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriate of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		*
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		es. L	
Claim(s) allowed:	lo lo	IHN G. WEISS	
Claim(s) objected to:		BY POTENT EXAMINI	ER .
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26</u> .	TECKINO	Luun ullii 22 3500	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	•	•	
10. Other:	()(· · · = · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 -	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 09/904,088

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises new issues, because adding limitiatons of claims 2, 20 and 24 into claims 1 and 9 changes scope of claims 1, 3-8, 9-16, thereby creating limitations not previously addressed.

In response to the applicant's argument that the cited prior art does not teach the inventive features, it is noted that this argument was full addrssed in the last Office Action of 8/24/2004.